DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 966 HE 010 415

AUTHOR	Brown, Laurence A.
TITLE	Employment of an Open Learning Course with Traditional and Nontraditional Learners. Working Paper No. 13.
INSTITUTION	University of Mid-America, Lincoln, Nebr.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 76
CONTRACT	NIE-G-75-001
NOTE	41p.; For related documents see HE 010 410 - HE 010 428
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Public Affairs and Information Services, University of Mid-America, Box 82006, Lincoln, Nebraska
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Accounting; Adult Education; *Course Evaluation; *Delivery Systems; Educational Television; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Multimedia Instruction; Nontraditional Students; *Open Education; *Student Attitudes; *Telecourses; Television Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS	On Campus Students; University of Mid America NE

ABSTRACT

The relative achievement and appeal effectiveness of a multimedia nontraditional course with open learning adult learners and on-campus students were examined in this study of a University of Mid-America course. Focus was on (1) the achievement and appeal effects, with on-campus students employing or omitting the television component in the offering of a nontraditional course, and (2) the relative appeal with on-campus students between a multimedia nontraditional course and a comparable traditional on-campus course. Among the more important findings from the study are: achievement nontraditional learners and on-campus students enrolled in a multimedia open learning is reasonably comparable; nontraditional learners rated the open learning course overall more appealing than did on-campus students; whether the integral television component of a multimedia nontraditional course was used had no significant effect on either achievement or course appeal with on-campus students; and no significant difference was detected between the appeal of a multimedia nontraditional course and the appeal of a traditional college course with two groups of comparable on-campus students. Written course evaluation forms are appended for the Accounting I course. (LBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159966

EMPLOYMENT OF AN OPEN LEARNING COURSE WITH TRADITIONAL AND NONTRADITIONAL LEARNERS

Working Paper No. 13

Office of
Research and Evaluation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 018 415

Laurence A. Brown
University of Mid-America

February 1976

This report was prepared pursuant to Grant #NIE-G-75-001 from the National Institute of Education to the University of Mid-America. This report does not necessarily represent the view of that agency.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the Office of Public Affairs and Information Services, University of Mid-America, Box 82006, Lincoln, NE., 68501.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Research Hypotheses	2
Methodology	5
Results	9
Conclusions and Implications for UMA	24
Summary	29
Appendices	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Comparison of achievement results and related data between Fall 1974 SUN Accounting I enrollees and Spring 1975 UNL Accounting 103 students using Accounting I materials	10
2	Comparison of course appeal measures between Fall 1974 SUN Accounting I enrollees (S) and Spring 1975 UNL beginning accounting students using Accounting I materials (U)	13
3	Comparison of achievement results between "TV seen" and "TV not seen" sections of Spring 1975 UNL Accounting 103 students using Accounting I course materials	18
4	Comparison of 'during-course' appeal measures between two sections of Spring 1975 UNL introductory accounting students using UMA Accounting I materials; one section using the TV component (T), and one not (N)	20
5	Comparison of 'end-of-course' appeal measures between two sections of Spring 1975 UNL introductory accounting students using UMA Accounting I materials; one section using the TV component (T), and one not (N)	20
6	Comparison of 'end-of-course' appeal measures between Spring 1975 UNL introductory accounting students using Accounting I materials (U) and those in regular UNL Accounting 103 sections (C)	23

AN OPEN LEARNING MULTIMEDIA COLLEGE LEVEL COURSE EMPLOYED WITH NONTRADITIONAL AND TRADITIONAL LEARNERS: SOME COMPARISONS

Introduction

The University of Mid-America (UMA) is a four-state nontraditional education consortium initiated through public and private funding principally for the development of postsecondary education courses for delivery by individual states to adult learners within an open learning context.[1]

The principal clientele for UMA courses, both as expected and in actuality, are adult learners who seek postsecondary educational experience for any of a variety of reasons but are either not willing or unable to enroll in on-campus courses. UMA and its various external audiences (e.g., NIE and other funding agencies) are vitally interested in obtaining data relating to a diversity of questions about this clientele. One specific area of interest (albeit somewhat speculative) concerns the comparison of achievement and course appeal between UMA learners and traditional on-campus students. For instance, can UMA course enrollees be expected to achieve as well or better than typical on-campus students? Do nontraditional adult learners respond differently to various aspects of a course than campus students?

These questions are not generally amenable to direct investigation because courses developed or acquired by UMA will not normally be utilized in on-campus settings. An exception to this general rule occurred early in 1975.

During the Spring 1975 semester at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL), circumstances made it possible to employ materials for a UMA course, Accounting I, with two sections of students enrolling in the introductory

---

[1]The principal funding agency providing support for UMA is the National Institute of Education, under the supervision of its Open Learning Branch.

accounting course at UNL (Accounting 103). UMA was thus presented with an opportunity to make some direct comparisons of achievement and appeal data between off-campus and on-campus students enrolling in what was essentially a common course. This is a report of the study undertaken in this regard.

The specific circumstances of this study also permitted the addressing of two other research concerns supplementary to that described but of interest both within UMA and to outside audiences. First, in a multimedia course employing an integral television component, what is the relative effect, both affective and cognitive, of offering the course with and without television? Second, how does a course developed by UMA for nontraditional learners compare, in terms of learner appeal, with a comparable course developed for on-campus students?

In the following sections, the research hypotheses addressed in the study are outlined, the methodology presented, results discussed, and tentative conclusions and implications for UMA suggested.

Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: No significant difference will be detected between on-campus and nontraditional learners utilizing UMA Accounting I materials in either appeal or achievement measures.

Prior to the conduct of this study, data were available as to the appeal of UMA courses to each UMA learner enrolled. This study would now make it possible to obtain similar measures from typical on-campus students and to compare the two sets of data. There was, however, no *a priori* basis for anticipating that significant differences would be detected between the two groups.

Hypothesis 2: The use of the television component of UMA Accounting I will not significantly affect on-campus learner achievement, but will significantly increase the appeal of the course for enrolled learners.

While much legitimate debate exists concerning cost factors relating to the use of television in nontraditional courseware, the fact remains that television is generally considered to be a relatively expensive part of multimedia courses. Because of this, funding agencies bring pressure to bear on course-producing entities to supply evidence that the use of television is cost-effective. Thus, UMA has and will continue to ask itself some hard questions relating to the use of television in courses. One such question concerns the effect on learners of the inclusion or exclusion of the television component in the offering of a course.

Up to the present time (and perhaps for some time to come), it has not been possible to collect data to address this issue. That is, UMA course offerings up to now have all included television components in both broadcast and videocassette forms. Some enrollees do report not seeing some or all television programs (for a variety of reasons) but such instances are sporadic and uncontrolled. The present study made it possible to address the question directly and to employ appropriate measures of control, albeit with a different population than is usual for UMA courses. The two sections of UNL students selected for the study used UMA Accounting I course materials. The materials for one section included the television programs, while the programs were omitted from the materials for the second section.

The television component of Accounting I was designed not for the purpose of introducing new content, but rather as a vehicle for providing examplars of several key concepts in each lesson.[2] This will not necessarily be the case

[2]For a more complete rendering of the nature and purpose of the television component in Accounting I, see the UMA Office of Research and Evaluation Working Paper No. 8 "Learner Responses to Television in UMA Courses."

with all UMA courses, but the role of television in Accounting I is considered representative of the general redundancy function television will play in UMA courses. It will deal with content already covered in some fashion elsewhere in the course, but will do so by utilizing the strengths and unique qualities of television.

In view of this, it was anticipated in this study that the use or non-use of television would have little noticeable effect on what had been learned during the course. Rather, the effect of television was expected to be in terms of the learners' affective responses to the course. It was anticipated the use of television would make the course more appealing.

Hypothesis 3: UMA Accounting I will be significantly more appealing to on-campus learners than will the comparable on-campus course, UNL Accounting 103.

UMA is committed to the policy of developing and acquiring courses that are not only educationally sound, but are appealing to a wide range of learners as well. An open learning enterprise does not have a captive audience. It is expected the level of enrollments in a UMA course will be commensurate with the overall appeal of the course to the population for which the course is intended. Some courses (e.g., one planned for pesticide applicators) will be directed to a narrow range of potential learners. Others (e.g., Introductory Psychology) are aimed at a much broader population. Whatever the range of interest in the content of a particular course, however, the course, it is assumed, must be produced to be appealing to as many of the intended users as possible. Thus, UMA Accounting I was intended to be a course with wide appeal across the broad range of those interested in obtaining initial skills and knowledge in accounting through a nontraditional format.

Having said this, the question remains: How do UMA course offerings fare in terms of learner appeal with comparable on-campus course offerings? The

present study provided opportunity to make a beginning in addressing this question. UNL students enrolled in Accounting 103, a UNL course comparable to UMA Accounting I, were asked to respond to some of the same course appeal questions asked of UNL students using UMA materials so a comparison could be made.

Methodology

Subjects:

Three separate groups of subjects are involved in this study: first, the 405 persons enrolled in the first offering of Accounting I by the State University of Nebraska (SUN), the statewide system in Nebraska for the delivery and administration of UMA courses; second, 61 UNL students enrolled in two introductory accounting sections using the UMA Accounting I course materials; and, third, 60 UNL students enrolled in three additional introductory accounting sections using the regular UNL Accounting 103 course materials.

The first group was relatively heterogeneous in terms of age, educational background and occupation. The last two groups were considerably more homogeneous along these dimensions.

Materials:

The materials of note in this study are those included in UMA Accounting I: 1) a textbook developed specifically for the course but comparable in format and style with traditional on-campus texts; 2) a detailed study guide that serves to direct learner progress through each lesson in the course, amplifying test content, providing self-tests and including questions, exercises and problems; 3) sixteen, 15 to 30-minute audio cassettes presenting accounting problems in a light, dramatic format designed for learner interaction; 4) fifteen, 30-minute television programs providing exemplars of key accounting

concepts through a variety of visualization techniques such as vignettes; and, 5) sixteen newspaper articles providing brief journalistic overviews of each lesson.

All of these course components were available for use by learners enrolled in the offering of Accounting I by SUN.[3] The text, study guide and audio cassettes were mailed to each learner. The television programs were available both in broadcast form and videocassettes maintained in four learning centers located within major population centers across the state. The newspaper articles were available in the Sunday edition of Nebraska's only statewide newspaper.

The Accounting I materials were available for use by UNL students enrolled in the on-campus Accounting I sections with the following exceptions: the newspaper articles were not used and, as indicated earlier, the television programs were used with only one section. The "TV" section saw the appropriate television program during one class section each week by means of closed circuit broadcast. They also could view the programs on videocassettes at the SUN learning center in Lincoln if desired. Ten sets of the audio cassettes were held on reserve in the University library together with cassette players. Each student purchased copies of the same text and study guide used by SUN Accounting I enrollees.

The UNL Accounting I students had two other instructional "aids" not as directly available to SUN Accounting I enrollees: the classroom teacher and interaction between students. SUN Accounting I enrollees could, if desired, contact the course faculty member (who happened to be the same person as the classroom teacher for UNL Accounting I students). As a general rule, however, SUN enrollees made relatively few such contacts. Similarly, SUN learners do

---

[3]Hereafter in this report, the offering of Accounting I to SUN learners will be called SUN Accounting I.

have opportunities for interaction with other learners but these are far less frequent than in on-campus classes.

The instructional materials or components used in the regular UNL Accounting 103 sections included, essentially, a textbook, the classroom teacher and considerable student interaction.

The criterion tests used to measure learner achievement were the same for SUN Accounting I enrollees and UNL Accounting I students. Three equally weighted multiple-choice tests of 28 to 30 items were administered during the course.

Procedures:

The instructional procedures employed with the two principal Accounting I groups, SUN enrollees and UNL students, were obviously much different. SUN enrollees essentially were engaged in an independent study program. The broadcast television programs were aired one a week over 16 weeks (excluding a two-week Christmas vacation period). These could serve as a pacing device since 16 weeks is approximately the length of a semester at UNL. The SUN enrollees were not, however, under close time constraints. There was a nominal date by which to complete the course (set at two months following the conclusion of the television broadcasts), but even this date was easily extended if a learner so requested. Enrollees studied at their own pace and took exams when prepared to do so. Learners were asked to submit two kinds of evaluation instruments (see Appendix A). Following completion of each of the six units of instruction, a unit evaluation form was to be returned. When a learner completed the last course examination, an end-of-course evaluation was mailed to the learner. Postage-free return envelopes were provided for returning forms.

The general procedures followed with both sections of UNL students using Accounting I materials were as follows: 50-minute class sessions were held on Monday, Wednesday and Friday mornings. As a general rule, one of the 16 topics or lessons in Accounting I was covered each week. The audio cassettes for the course were held on reserve in the library for individual student use. Tests were administered during normal class hours following the completion of topics included on the test. Prior to each of the testing sessions, students were asked to complete and submit brief evaluation forms comparable to the unit evaluation forms submitted by SUN enrollees. At the last testing session, students were also asked to complete an end-of-course evaluation form similar to the form for SUN learners (see Appendix B).

For the section utilizing the television programs, the following specific procedures were followed: At the beginning of the first session devoted to a topic, the instructor provided a brief introduction to the television program. The program was then seen and the remainder of the session was used to discuss the concepts covered by the program.

With the section not employing the television, the instructor used the first day on an assigned topic to lecture on the same concepts included in the television program for that topic.

The second and third sessions spent on a topic were each essentially the same for both groups. The second day was devoted partially to lecturing by the instructor on portions of the lesson and partially to discussion of assigned homework problems. During the final session, the instructor first answered questions relating to any aspect of the topic, and then provided needed assistance with assigned homework problems.

The end-of-course form submitted by the UNL students using Accounting I materials was also administered to three comparable sections of UNL students using the materials for UNL Accounting 103.

Results

1. Comparing achievement and appeal measures between on-campus and nontraditional learners enrolled in an open learning multimedia course.

Comparison of Achievement

It was hypothesized that no significant achievement differences would be detected between SUN learners enrolled in Accounting I and UNL on-campus students enrolled in the beginning accounting course sections using Accounting I materials. A summary of achievement results and related data for these two groups is shown in Table 1. It should be noted that SUN course enrollees can take a course "for credit" or "not for credit". Only those enrolling for college credit are included in the achievement comparisons made here inasmuch as it is generally only the "for credit" enrollees who take tests and receive grades. It should also be noted that about a third of those originally enrolling "for credit" in SUN Accounting I were permitted to change their enrollment to "not for credit" during the course.

Table 1 reveals the following:

1. An equal percentage (96%) of SUN and UNL enrollees who completed the respective courses received passing grades.

2. A markedly larger percentage of UNL total enrollees (50%) passed the course (as of September 1, 1975).

3. SUN enrollees received on the average, slightly higher grades than did UNL students.

Several things work together to confound the interpretation of these results. First, there is the problem of different time allowances for course completion. SUN is an "open learning" enterprise and one aspect of the program involves flexibility in terms of course completion. Enrollees in the Fall 1974 SUN Accounting I course were still completing the course one year later. The UNL

Table 1. Comparison of achievement results and related data between Fall 1974 SUN Accounting I enrollees and Spring 1975 UNL Accounting 103 students using Accounting I materials.

I. SUN Enrollees

Enrollment "for credit" in Fall 1974 Accounting I offering 273

Number of "for credit" enrollees completing course as of 9-1-75 . . 141

Course grades assigned "for credit" enrollees, and grade percentages of "for credit" completions and enrollment:

	Grade								
	A+	A	B+	B	C+	C*	D+	D	F
Number Assigned	3	23	22	42	15	22	5	4	5
Percent of Completions	2	16	16	30	11	16	4	3	4
Percent of Enrollment	1	8	8	15	5	8	2	1	2

*Includes two who received a "pass" on the Pass/Fail option

Overall percentage of course completers who passed	96%
Overall percentage of "for credit" enrollees who passed	50%
Average grade assigned (excluding those assigned "Pass")	B

II. UNL Students

Enrollment in two Spring 1975 Accounting 103 sections using Accounting I materials 60

Number of enrollees completing course as of 9-1-75 52

Course grades assigned, and grade percentages of completions and total enrollment:

	Grade								
	A+	A	B+	B	C+	C	D+	D	F
Number Assigned	2	5	5	7	6	14	6	5	2
Percent of Completions	4	10	10	13	12	27	12	10	4
Percent of Enrollment	3	8	8	12	10	23	10	8	3

Overall percentage of course completers who passed	96%
Overall percentage of enrollees who passed	83%
Average grade assigned	C+

students in this study, on the other hand, were required--except under emergency circumstances--to complete the course by the prescribed final exam session. Technically, this gave the SUN enrollees considerably more time to prepare for examinations. There is, however, some research data suggesting this additional time might provide only a negligible advantage or may even be a detriment. In fact, data from the same SUN learners included in this study indicate that higher exam grades were attained by Accounting I enrollees who took exams at or near the time prescribed rather than waiting until later.

A second confounding factor relates to the "optional" versus "mandatory" nature of examinations within the respective groups. SUN learners are not required to take examinations. If they are enrolled "for credit" they must, of course, take all exams and receive an overall passing grade in order to receive college credit. They are in no way penalized, however, if they choose not to complete the course (except they may have wasted the time and money invested). The situation is vastly different with UNL students. Once past the allowed grace period for dropping the course it is necessary for them to complete it or face the prospect of receiving a "F" on their permanent record (unless circumstances permit the granting of an "incomplete"). For this reason, part I of Table 1 includes the original "for credit" SUN Accounting I enrollment as the figure comparable to the overall UNL enrollment included in part II. This assumes the SUN learners originally enrolling "for credit" are the group most comparable to the UNL students. It is further assumed, then, the comparison between those originally enrolled in the two programs respectively is one critical point in comparing achievement levels.

These two assumptions are undermined somewhat by the fact that enrolling "for credit" meant different things to different SUN learners whereas it may be presumed that all or most UNL students enroll for the overriding purpose of

furthering progress toward a degree. Some SUN learners had the same interest, but many had different intentions or aspirations. Many SUN learners who enrolled "for credit" were not strongly committed to the task of obtaining college credit. Therefore, when the external demands of home or employment or the internal demands of the course become pressing, these learners found it a relatively simple matter to cease their involvement in the course. Learners dropping out (or "stopping out", for some can be expected to complete the course eventually) in this fashion account, it is thought, for much of the difference in percentages of the original enrollees in each group who completed the course.

A final confounding variable to recognize, in comparing the achievement of the two groups, relates to motivation. Most UNL students enrolled in the introductory accounting course have little choice in the matter of taking the course. If they are to receive a degree in accounting or from another related department, they must take and pass the course whether interested in it or not. SUN learners enrolled in Accounting I were virtually all volunteers who enrolled because of some interest in the subject. This apparent difference in the motivation for enrollment between the two groups may well account for the somewhat higher achievement level of SUN learners.

Comparison of Appeal

The hypothesis with respect to appeal was that no significant difference would be detected between the appeal of SUN Accounting I for SUN learners and that of the introductory accounting course employing Accounting I materials for UNL students.

Table 2 presents a summary of the common during-course and end-of-course appeal measures obtained from these two groups; the mean ratings of each group; and, where the difference in means was significant, the level of significance.

Table 2. Comparison of course appeal measures between Fall 1974 SUN Accounting I enrollees (S) and Spring 1975 UNL beginning accounting students using Accounting I materials (U)

I. During-Course Evaluation Forms (overall averages from six SUN learner Unit Evaluation Forms and three UNL student Intermediate Evaluation Forms)

Appeal Item	Response Options and Means					Signif.
1. Overall Appeal	Excel.	Very Good (S)	Good (U)	Fair	Poor	**
2. Overall Clarity	Except. Clear	Very Clear (S)	Reason. Clear (U)	Unclear	Very Unclear	
3. Pacing of Materials	Too Fast	Somewhat Fast (S, U)	Just Right	Somewhat Slow	Too Slow	
4. Overall Difficulty	Very Difficult	Somewhat Difficult (S, U)	Just Right	Somewhat Easy	Very Easy	
5. Overall Interest	Very Interest.	Fairly Interest. (S)	Neutral (U)	Not Very Interest.	Boring	**
6. Amount Learned	A Great Deal (S, U)	Some	Not Much	Nothing		
7. Importance of What was Learned	Very Important	Important (S, U)	Generally Unimport.	A Waste		
8. Amount of Work Required	Too Much	Just Right (S, U)	Too Little			
9. Helpfulness of Instructional Aids						
a. Television	Very Helpful	Helpful (S, U)	Not Helpful			
b. Audio Tapes		S	U			**
c. Text		S	U			*
d. Study Guide		S	U			
10. General Comments About Course	Very Positive	Positive	Neutral (S, U)	Negative	Very Negative	

Table 2. (cont.)

II. End-of-Course Evaluation Forms

Appeal Item	Response Options and Means	Signif.
1. Overall Rating	Excel. | Good (S) | Fair | Poor | Unsat. (U)	**
2. Interest	Very Interest. | Fairly Interest. (S) | Neutral | Rather Uninter. | Very Uninter. (U)	**
3. Difficulty	Very Difficult | Fairly Difficult (S) | Neutral | Fairly Easy | Very Easy (U)	*
4. Responsibility on Learner	Much Too Heavy | A Little Too Heavy | About Right (S) | Not Quite Enough | Much Too Light (U)	
5. Examinations:		
a. Length	Much Too Long | Somewhat Long (U) | About Right (S) | Somewhat Short | Much Too Short	*
b. Fairness	Fair in Choice Of Content (S) | Unfair in Choice Of Content (U)	
c. Difficulty	Too Difficult (U) | About Right (S) | Too Easy	
d. Number	Too Many | About Right (S) | Too Few (U)	**

** Significant at the .001 level

* Significant at the .005 level

Study of Table 2 reveals that although in about a third of the cases there are significant differences, in terms of most common appeal measures, the responses of the two groups of learners are comparable. Some of these differences are, however, of considerable importance.

Both during the course and at its conclusion, the UNL students rated the course significantly lower in terms of its overall appeal and of their interest in it. These lower overall ratings may be due to the broader experience of the UNL students with college level courses; experience frequently resulting in a critical view of course materials by university students. Whatever the reason, the UNL group did consider the course less appealing than did SUN learners.

During the course, two other significant appeal rating differences occurred, both concerning the rating of the helpfulness of two of the instructional components of the course, the audio cassettes and the textbook. Again, the lower ratings were from the UNL students. With respect to the audio cassette appeal, it should be noted that in contrast with the employment of the other media components of the course (television, text and study guide), there was a marked difference in the use of the audio cassettes. All SUN learners received the cassettes with the other course materials and, thus, had them for use wholly at their own discretion. The UNL students had the option of purchasing the cassettes (which some did) or simply using one of ten sets placed on library reserve. It is fair to say these circumstances would probably tend to reduce the perceived helpfulness of the audio cassettes for the UNL students.

The significant difference in the appeal of the text may be due, as suggested above with respect to the overall course ratings, to extensive exposure of college students to academic course and textbooks. Another factor

may also have some effect here. UNL students (and presumably college students everywhere) are, at present, seemingly surfeited with mandated evaluations of courses, instructors and course materials (largely limited to textbooks and related print material). The fairly recent experience of the present evaluator is that under these conditions student responses to evaluation questions tend to gravitate to the mean and seldom reflect enthusiastic approval. The fact the average response of the UNL students to each of the course components was less positive than the SUN learners would seem to produce some support for this view.

Comparison of the end-of-course evaluation forms reveals three other significant differences between measures other than those already mentioned. First, in terms of course difficulty, the SUN learners rated the course significantly more difficult than did the UNL students. This is the only instance where the course was rated significantly better (if "easier" is better) by the UNL group. In this connection, it is of interest to note that with respect to 16 of 21 measures during and after the course, the UNL ratings of the course or elements of it were lower than SUN ratings. In most cases, these were not significant differences, but the tendency itself does seem important. In a similar vein, in 16 of 21 measures, the UNL ratings were closer to the mean response option than were the SUN ratings. This fact may provide further evidence of a response set on the part of university students to "lean to the mean" in their ratings.

The other two significant differences between measures on the end-of-course forms pertained to the course examinations. In terms of the length of tests given, the UNL students tended to consider the tests somewhat long, whereas the SUN learners generally thought the length of tests was just right. This might reflect on the fact that SUN learners could take the tests when

when they desired and were not under the same time contraint (50-minute class period) as were the UNL students. With respect to the number of tests administered, the UNL students were more inclined than SUN learners to consider the number of tests as too few.

In order to integrate all these appeal findings into one overall finding that would tend to support or refute the research hypothesis of no difference in appeal, a multi-variate analysis of the differences should be conducted. Circumstances have not permitted, up to this point, the employment of this more sophisticated and revealing procedure. The findings as reported, however, do not support the hypothesis. They tend, rather, to refute it. Significant differences between individual measures of appeal with the SUN and UNL groups occurred. In seven of the eight cases of significant differences, the Accounting I course was rated lower in appeal by the UNL student.

2. The relative effect of employing the television component of an open learning multimedia course with on-campus learners.

Comparison of Achievement

It was hypothesized that the use of the television component of SUN Accounting I would not significantly affect the achievement of UNL students using the television component, in comparison with students not using it. Data relating to the achievement of the two experimental groups are shown in Table 3.

It may be seen from Table 3 that the hypothesis relating to achievement results between the two groups is supported by the data. Differences in test score means for the three examinations and total score means for course completers are not significantly different and the average grades for the two groups are the same.

Table 3. Comparison of achievement results between "TV seen" and "TV not seen" sections of Spring 1975 UNL Accounting 103 students using Accounting I course materials.

		Test Score Means				
Section	N	1st	2nd	3rd	Total*	Avg. Grade
TV programs seen	28	21.63	18.67	19.54	61.86	C+
TV programs not seen	33	21.06	19.55	20.07	61.10	C+

*Total score means includes only scores from students completing all exams and receiving course grade (22 and 29 students respectively).

Comparison of Appeal

The research hypothesis with respect to appeal was that the use of the television component would significantly increase the appeal of the course employing Accounting I materials for those UNL students using television compared with course appeal for students not using television. Tables 4 and 5 provide a comparative summary of during-course and end-of-course appeal measures from the two groups.

Even a cursory examination of Tables 4 and 5 reveals that the data presented there do not support this hypothesis. It may be seen that, in the case of most appeal measures, the section of UNL students not using the Accounting I television programs rated the course elements lower than did the other section. In no single instance, however, was the difference in appeal significant. Once again a multivariate analysis of the various appeal differences would provide for a more secure indication of support or refutation of the hypothesis. Nevertheless, it is a reasonably safe inference from the data presented that use of the television programs did not significantly enhance the appeal of the course.

At only one point in the data presented in Tables 4 and 5 does it appear that the use or non-use of television affected student appeal responses (although even here it is difficult to ascribe any degree of significance). In rating all the instructional aids of the course in terms of importance, slightly more than a quarter of the group not seeing television rated "class discussion" between second and third in importance on the average. Less than ten percent of the "TV section" rated it at all, and those doing so considered discussion of relatively little importance. Inasmuch as the "no television" group had one less aid to include in the ratings, it is to be expected that this group would tend to fill the gap by including other aids. It would seem logical, however, that the appropriate aid to substitute for television would be "Lecture/Instructor"

Table 4. Comparison of 'during-course' appeal measures between two sections of Spring '75 UNL introductory accounting students using UMA Accounting I materials; one section using the TV component (T), and one not (N)

Appeal Item	Response Options and Means				
1. Overall Appeal	Excellent	Very Good	Good (T, N)	Fair	Poor
2. Overall Clarity	Except'ly Clear	Very Clear	Reasonably Clear (T, N)	Unclear	Very Unclear
3. Pacing of Materials	Too Fast	Somewhat Fast	Just Right (T, N)	Somewhat Slow	Too Slow
4. Overall Difficulty	Very Difficult	Somewhat Difficult (T, N)	Just Right	Somewhat Easy	Very Easy
5. Overall Interest	Very Interesting	Fairly Interesting (T, N)	Neutral	Not Very Interesting	Boring
6. Study Time per Week	1-3 Hrs.	4-6 Hrs.	7-9 Hrs. (T, N)	10-12 Hrs.	13-15 Hrs.
7. Amount Learned	A Great Deal (T, N)	Some	Not Much		Nothing
8. Importance of What was Learned	Very Important	Important (T, N)	Generally Unimportant		A Waste
9. Amount of Work Required		Too Much	Just Right (T, N)	Too Little	
10. Helpfulness of Instructional Aids		Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful	
a. Television (one section only)			T		
b. Audio Tapes			T, N		
c. Text			T, N		
d. Study Guide			T, N		
11. General Comments about Course	Very Positive	Positive	Neutral (T, N)	Negative	Very Negative

Table 5. Comparison of 'end-of-course' appeal measures between two sections of Spring '75 UNL introductory accounting students using UMA Accounting I materials; one section using the TV component(T), and one not (N)

Appeal Item	Response Options and Means				
1. Overall Rating	Excellent	Good (T, N)	Fair	Poor	Unsatisfactory
2. Interest	Very Interesting	Fairly Interesting (T, N)	Neutral	Fairly Unint.	Very Unint.

Table 5. (cont.)

Appeal Item	Response Options and Means
3. Difficulty	Very Difficult / Fairly Difficult / Neutral / Fairly Easy / Very Easy — T, N
4. Responsibility on Learner	Much Too Heavy / A Little Too Heavy / About Right / Not Quite Enough / Much Too Light — T, N
5. Examinations:	
a. Length	Much Too Long / Somewhat Long / About Right / Somewhat Short / Much Too Short — T, N
b. Fairness	Fair in Choice of Content / Unfair in Choice of Content — T, N
c. Difficulty	Too Difficult / About Right / Too Easy — T, N
d. Number	Too Many / About Right / Too Few — T, N

6. Importance of Instructional Aids:

Aid	N	(Most Important) 1	2	3	4	(Least Important) 5
a. Study Guide	T = 23		T			
	N = 29		N			
b. Text	T = 26		T			
	N = 28		N			
c. Audio Tapes	T = 21				T	
	N = 29				N	
d. Television (T only)	T = 20				T	
e. Lecture/Instructor	T = 10			T		
	N = 12			N		
f. Class Discussion	T = 2					T
	N = 8		N			
g. Other	T = 4					T
	N = 9			N		

	Yes	Can't Say	No
7. Would recommend course to friends?		T, N	
8. Would take more accounting?		T, N	

	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Can't Say	Probably No	Definitely No
8. Would recommend TV for use with future classes? (T only)	3	12	* 4 (Mean)	2	3

inasmuch as the instructor was largely lecturing during the comparable time the other section watched television. Nevertheless, the non-use of the television component somehow enhanced the perceived importance of in-class discussion with no significant increase in the perceived importance of the instructor. There was, as might be expected, also some increase in the listing of various "other" aids by non-television students and in the ascription of importance to such aids by these students.

3. Comparing the relative course appeal to on-campus students enrolled in a nontraditional multimedia course with comparable students enrolled in a traditional on-campus course.

It was hypothesized that students in sections using the UMA Accounting I introductory accounting materials would find the course more appealing than comparable students enrolled in sections of the traditional on-campus introductory UNL Accounting 103 course. Table 6 sets forth the data relating to this hypothesis.

With one exception, no appeal measure comparison between the two groups of students in question provided significant support for the last research hypothesis posed. Table 6 shows the difference in measures between the experimental Accounting I sections and Accounting 103 control sections to be negligible in the majority of cases and only slight in several others. The only significant difference detected was in terms of students' perceptions regarding the number of examinations. The students in the UMA Accounting I sections indicated there were too few tests (there were three equal-weighted exams). The Accounting 103 students, on the other hand, considered the number of tests they took (three during the course and a final) as about right.

The significant difference on the number of tests taken is, however, the exception that proves the rule: The two groups of students being compared did not appear to differ significantly in terms of their overall affective response

Table 6. Comparison of 'end-of-course' appeal measures between Spring '75 UNL introductory accounting students using Accounting I materials (U) and those in regular UNL Accounting 103 sections (C)

Appeal Item	Response Options and Means	Signif.
1. Overall Rating	Excel. — Good (U, C) — Fair — Poor — Unsat.	
2. Interest	Very Interest. — Fairly Interest. (U, C) — Neutral — Rather Uninter. — Very Uninter.	
3. Difficulty	Very Difficult — Fairly Difficult (U, C) — Neutral — Fairly Easy — Very Easy	
4. Responsibility on Learner	Much Too Heavy — A Little Too Heavy (U, C) — About Right — Not Quite Enough — Much Too Light	
5. Examinations:		
a. Length	Much Too Long — Somewhat Long (U, C) — About Right — Somewhat Short — Much Too Short	
b. Fairness	Fair in Choice Of Content (U, C) — Unfair in Choice Of Content	
c. Difficulty	Too Difficult — About Right (U, C) — Too Easy	
d. Number	Too Many — About Right (C) — Too Few (U)	**
6. Would Recommend Course to Friends	Yes — Don't Know (U) — No (C)	
7. Would Take More Accounting	U, C	

** Significant at the .001 level

to the introductory accounting course taken. It is noteworthy, in the case of every appeal measure but the one pertaining to test length, the difference in means between the two groups was opposite to that hypothesized. Students in the control sections (UNL Accounting 103) consistently rated the introductory accounting course they took more highly than did students using the UMA Accounting I materials. All that can be said with certainty at this point, however, is the data do not support the hypothesis that the UMA Accounting I materials will have a greater appeal for on-campus students than will the parallel campus course materials.

Conclusions and Implications for UMA

Perhaps the principal conclusion to be drawn from the present study is that it is an extremely difficult and problematical task to compare the use of an open learning nontraditional course (even when developed as a college-level credit course) by its intended open learning adult audience and the traditional on-campus student. The way is fraught with confounding influences. Ignoring these influences for the present, however, tentative conclusions and attendant implications for UMA are to be drawn from the following results.

Comparing achievement and affective responses of nontraditional adult learners and on-campus students.

- Nontraditional adult learners who complete an open learning college-level course can be expected to achieve as well or better than on-campus learners using the same course materials within a more traditional college course structure.

To the extent the conclusion is valid, it helps to allay fears of external audiences that UMA courses are not as rigorous as on-campus courses. In the light of the open admissions policy of UMA and the common enrollment of adults not recently involved in academic pursuits and/or without college experience, this conclusion, though tentative, is gratifying.

- A considerably smaller proportion of nontraditional adult learners can be expected to complete a college-level open learning course than the percentage of on-campus students completing a comparable classroom course.

There is, of course, nothing surprising about this conclusion. It is to be expected, given the course completion flexibility under open learning and the contrasting relatively inflexible completion circumstances on campus. The importance of reiterating this conclusion rests in the support it provides for a contention previously stated: UMA, or any open learning enterprise, should provide guidelines and encouragement for related delivery systems to maintain close contact with course enrollees, assisting them to successful course completion. Some evidence to date suggests that a course which has forever to be done will never be done (at least by some enrollees), and that external assistance and encouragement is necessary if a respectable percentage of enrollees are to complete a course within reasonable timelines.

- Nontraditional adult learners enrolled in open learning college-level courses tend to find the course more appealing than would on-campus students utilizing the same course materials in a traditional college setting.

The important thing to stress here is not the relatively lower appeal to college students but rather the significantly higher appeal to the intended population for the course. UMA can, it may be tentatively concluded, expect that nontraditional learners enrolling in the course will be relatively more positively disposed toward the course and its elements than would college students toward a comparable on-campus course. This is to say that an open learning enterprise such as UMA is not faced with the prospect of having to "sell" its goods to a clientele for whom educational pursuits may have lost some glamour. Nontraditional learners can be expected to approach their involvement in a course in somewhat a tabular rasa condition. This is not to say that open learning course enrollees are naive or unable to make critical

judgments. On the contrary, it has already been learned that UMA course enrollees are quick to make criticisms and reasonable judgments regarding things they like and dislike about courses. What this conclusion does imply is that UMA can expect its enrollees to enter into the study of a course in an open and receptive way. Criticisms by learners can thus be accepted as being largely based on honest appraisal of the course itself.

- The relative appeal of an open learning college-level course for nontraditional learners is not a function of the perceived ease of the course by the learners.

It will be remembered that the only appeal measure wherein SUN learners rated the course lower than UNL learners concerned the degree of difficulty of the course. The UNL students rated the course relatively less difficult than did SUN learners, but the course was significantly more appealing to SUN learners along several dimensions.

The implications of this conclusion for UMA is that there need be little concern that nontraditional postsecondary enrollees in open learning courses are "fair weather learners," seeking easy courses and showing dissatisfaction with rigorous ones. For open learning students, as for on-campus students, there does not appear to be any direct correlation between course difficulty and course appeal.

Comparing the cognitive and affective effects of including or excluding the television component of a multimedia college-level course on enrolled traditional on-campus students.

- The use or non-use of the television component of a multimedia college-level course, when the television component presents content also presented in other components, will not significantly affect the achievement level of on-campus students enrolled in the course.

This conclusion, if true and if assumed to be generalizable to open learning enrollees, suggests the following: The justification for including in a course

a television component that serves a supportive or redundancy role as an instructional medium does not lie in the positive and significant effect its inclusion makes on the achievement of enrollees.

- The use or non-use of the television component of a multimedia college-level course, when the television component presents content also presented in other components, will not significantly affect course appeal for on-campus students enrolled in the course.

This conclusion is a more troublesome one for UMA than the previous one. If the use of television does not enhance either achievement or course appeal, how can its employment be justified? The answer to this question, or at least an initial tentative response, has two parts.

First, there is reason to believe the course used in this study does not provide an adequate test for the hypothesis. Two arguments provide support for this view: Introductory Accounting is, at this point, not considered to be a course that lends itself particularly well to the effective use of television as a course component. From almost the beginning of the development of SUN Accounting I, it was clear to the course developers it would be difficult to incorporate a television component effectively. (The view of the course producer was: "If we can successfully use television in this course, we can do it with any course!") In addition to this innate difficulty, there is another factor militating against the appropriateness of using Accounting I for comparing the use or non-use of a television component. It became clear during the first two offerings of Accounting I to SUN enrollees that the television programs were not considered by enrollees to constitute a very important component of the component of the course. Many Accounting I learners were, in fact, quite critical of the programs overall. These two factors taken together suggest that the formulation of any definitive conclusions regarding the effect on learner appeal of the use or non-use of a television component of a course

ought to be held in abeyance until further study can be undertaken using one or more additional UMA courses having television components more amenable to such study.

The second major point relating to justifying the use of television in spite of the apparent lack of effect on achievement or appeal concerns the pacing role of broadcast television. Some evidence obtained from SUN Accounting I learners suggests that a major role of broadcast television in any UMA course is to help pace enrollees in their progress through the course. This aspect of the use or non-use of television in Accounting I could not be tested here inasmuch as there are other (and more assertive) pacing elements at work in an on-campus course. When considering the effectiveness of a course television component with nontraditional learners, however, the pacing role of broadcast television must be included in the evaluation of data.

Comparing the appeal of a nontraditional multimedia course with that of a comparable on-campus course for two groups of comparable on-campus students.

- On-campus students do not find a nontraditional multimedia course, such as Accounting I, significantly more appealing than a comparable traditional on-campus course.

It is not clear, at this point, what specific implications--if any--this tentative conclusion has for UMA. Perhaps the most that can be said is UMA should not make an *a priori* judgment that its courses, involving as they do a diversity of media and the expenditures of relatively large sums of production expenses and time, will be significantly more appealing to any population of learners than would a comparable on-campus course. This very tenuous conclusion should, of course, be further tested with other course offerings. If the conclusion were to be significantly strengthened through replication studies, it could have indirect implications concerning the judgments of external (particularly funding) audiences regarding the cost effectiveness of UMA courses.

It must be borne in mind, however, when considering this conclusion that factors other than the relative appeal of a course designed for nontraditional learners when compared with a comparable on-campus course are certainly more weighty in determining the success of an open learning course. The fundamental criterion for such success must be: "Does the course meet, as effectively as possible, the identified needs of the selected population of learners?".

Summary

This study examined the following:

1. The relative achievement and appeal effectiveness of a multimedia nontraditional course with open learning adult learners and on-campus students.

2. The achievement and appeal effects, with on-campus students, of employing or omitting the television component in the offering of a nontraditional course.

3. The relative appeal with on-campus students between a multimedia nontraditional course and a comparable traditional on-campus course.

The following constitute the more important findings from the study:

- All things considered, the achievement of nontraditional learners and on-campus students enrolled in a multimedia open learning is, as hypothesized, reasonably comparable.

- Contrary to expectations, nontraditional learners rated the open learning course overall more appealing than did on-campus students.

- Whether the integral television component of a multimedia nontraditional course was used or not had no significant effect on either achievement or course appeal with on-campus students. With respect to achievement, this finding was expected but it was hypothesized that a significant appeal difference would be detected. It was thought the use of television would enhance course appeal.

- No significant difference was detected between the appeal of a multimedia nontraditional course and the appeal of a traditional college course with two groups of comparable on-campus students. It had been anticipated that the nontraditional course would be the more appealing.

A number of tentative conclusions and attendant implications for UMA stem from these findings.

Appendix A

Written course evaluation forms submitted by learners enrolled in SUN Accounting I, Fall 1974

1. "Tell Us What You Think"; during-course form submitted following each of six content units

2. End-of-Course form submitted following completion of last examination

TELL US WHAT YOU THINK

In order to improve SUN courses, we need your reactions to each unit of the course. We will be using your reactions to make changes and revisions in the course. Please answer the questions below. Your answers will not affect your grade in any way. Thank you for helping us.

Course _____ Unit number _____ Date _____

1. Overall, how would you rate this unit?

( ) Excellent
( ) Very Good
( ) Good
( ) Fair
( ) Poor

2. How would you rate the overall clarity of the content?

( ) Exceptionally Clear
( ) Very Clear
( ) Reasonably Clear
( ) Unclear
( ) Very Unclear

3. How did you find the overall pacing of the materials?

( ) Too Fast
( ) Somewhat Fast
( ) Just Right
( ) Somewhat Slow
( ) Too Slow

4. The material in this unit is:

( ) Very Difficult
( ) Somewhat Difficult
( ) Just Right
( ) Somewhat Easy
( ) Very Easy

5. How interesting is this unit?

( ) Very Interesting
( ) Fairly Interesting
( ) Neutral
( ) Not Very Interesting
( ) Boring

6. How many hours did you spend on this unit (including TV presentation)?

( ) 1-3 hours
( ) 4-6 hours
( ) 7-9 hours
( ) 10-12 hours
( ) 13-15 hours
( ) More than 15

7. I learned:

( ) A Great Deal
( ) Some
( ) Not Much
( ) Nothing

8. What I learned is:

( ) Very Important
( ) Important
( ) Generally Unimportant
( ) A Waste

9. Total amount of work is:

( ) Too much
( ) Just right
( ) Too little

10. How helpful did you find the resources you used in this unit?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not helpful	Did not use or Not applicable
Newspaper	( )	( )	( )	( )
Television	( )	( )	( )	( )
Cassette Tape	( )	( )	( )	( )
Slide/Tape	( )	( )	( )	( )
Assigned readings or text	( )	( )	( )	( )
Extra or recommended readings	( )	( )	( )	( )
Study Guide	( )	( )	( )	( )
Learning Center	( )	( )	( )	( )
Toll-free telephone line	( )	( )	( )	( )

11. Please write any additional comments you may have below or use the back of this sheet

SUN END-OF-COURSE EVALUATION FORM

Now that you have completed a SUN course, would you help us in the improvement of this course (and future ones) by completing and sending to us this questionnaire? Your response to each of the questions below is extremely important to us. We ask that you include your name and social security number. Your responses, however, can in no way affect your grade, and you will not be individually identified in any way in the use made of these responses. Please be candid! Thank you very much.

NAME: _____ SOC. SEC. NO. _____

COURSE: _____ DATE: _____

1. Overall, how would you rate this course?
   - ( ) Excellent
   - ( ) Good
   - ( ) Fair
   - ( ) Poor
   - ( ) Unsatisfactory

2. How interesting was this course to you?
   - ( ) Very Interesting
   - ( ) Fairly Interesting
   - ( ) Neutral
   - ( ) Rather Uninteresting
   - ( ) Very Uninteresting

3. This course places the responsibility for learning on the student.
   - ( ) much too heavily
   - ( ) a little too heavily
   - ( ) about the right amount
   - ( ) not quite enough
   - ( ) much too lightly

4. Overall, how difficult was this course for you?
   - ( ) Very Difficult
   - ( ) Fairly Difficult
   - ( ) Neutral
   - ( ) Fairly Easy
   - ( ) Very Easy

5. In the spaces provided below, please list in order of importance any specific things (up to three) that were significant in making it difficult for you to participate fully in this course. Several (but not all) possible answers are listed below. You may simply use the letter of any of these if you wish, or you may write out other things.

   1) _____

   2) _____

   3) _____

Possible things that might have made the course difficult

- a. Work pressures and responsibilities
- b. Domestic interruptions and demands
- c. Lack of personal contact with teachers
- d. Lack of personal contact with other students
- e. Self-discipline: getting down to regular work
- f. Program pace: keeping up with the TV broadcast schedule
- g. Academic and learning problems: starting to study again, new methods, concentration, memory, etc.
- h. Lack of time and energy
- i. Personal disability
- j. Obtaining books and other materials
- k. Opposition from family members or close friends
- l. Inconvenience of course examination procedures

6. How would you rate the course examinations (those taken at a learning center or library)? Check one in each group.
   - ( ) Much too long
   - ( ) Somewhat too long
   - ( ) About right length
   - ( ) Somewhat too short
   - ( ) Much too short
   - ( ) Fair in choice of content
   - ( ) Unfair in content choice
   - ( ) Too difficult
   - ( ) About right difficulty
   - ( ) Too easy
   - ( ) Too many tests
   - ( ) About right number
   - ( ) Too few tests

7. Did taking a SUN course involve you in any expenses that were significant to you? (Please respond to each item.)

	Considerable Expense	Some Expense	Little or No Expense
Loss of overtime work	( )	( )	( )
Reduced part-time work	( )	( )	( )
Tuition cost	( )	( )	( )
Babysitting cost	( )	( )	( )
Course material costs	( )	( )	( )
Traveling costs	( )	( )	( )
Other _____			
_____	( )	( )	( )

8. To what extent did you keep up with the TV broadcast schedule of the course?
   - ( ) I kept up without too much difficulty.
   - ( ) I kept up pretty well, but with some difficulty.
   - ( ) I didn't keep up, but was never more than a few weeks behind.
   - ( ) I wasn't able to keep up and fell progressively farther behind.
   - ( ) I determined my own study schedule from the start and purposely did not pace my study by the TV schedule.

9. Did you at any time during the course feel a pressing need for course-related assistance from SUN? Yes ___ No ___

   If your answer to the above was "Yes":

   a. Did you attempt to obtain help from SUN ___ ___
   b. Were you able to make contact with the appropriate person to obtain help? ___ ___
   c. Did you receive the help you needed? ___ ___

10. In the space below list in order of importance to you the various instructional aids used in the course you took (e.g., TV, text, study guide, etc.). List the most important first. Include learning center and/or telephone if important to you in the course.

    1) _____ 5) _____

    2) _____ 6) _____

    3) _____ 7) _____

    4) _____ 8) _____

11. Is it likely that you would enroll in another SUN course sometime?
    ( ) YES ( ) NO
    What considerations entered into your answer?

    _____

    _____

    What course(s) would you be interested in taking?

    _____

12. Do you have specific recommendations to make to the SUN staff for improving this course? (Use back as necessary)

Appendix B

Written course evaluation forms submitted by UNL students enrolled in introductory accounting sections using Accounting I materials, Spring 1975

1. "Tell Us What You Think"; during-course form submitted prior to each of three examinations

2. End-of-Course form submitted following completion of last examination (Note: This form also administered to three UNL Accounting 103 sections as a control)

TELL US WHAT YOU THINK

In order to improve this course, we need your reactions to each unit of the course. We will be using your reactions to make changes and revisions in the course. Please answer the questions below. Your answers will not affect your grade in any way. Thank you for helping us.

Name _____ Course _____ Unit _____ Date _____

1. Overall, how would you rate this unit?

( ) Excellent
( ) Very Good
( ) Good
( ) Fair
( ) Poor

2. How would you rate the overall clarity of the content?

( ) Exceptionally Clear
( ) Very Clear
( ) Reasonably Clear
( ) Unclear
( ) Very Unclear

3. How did you find the overall pacing of the materials?

( ) Too Fast
( ) Somewhat Fast
( ) Just Right
( ) Somewhat Slow
( ) Too Slow

4. The material in this unit is:

( ) Very Difficult
( ) Somewhat Difficult
( ) Just Right
( ) Somewhat Easy
( ) Very Easy

5. How interesting is this unit?

( ) Very Interesting
( ) Fairly Interesting
( ) Neutral
( ) Not Very Interesting
( ) Boring

6. How many hours per week did you spend on this unit (including class time)?

( ) 1-3 hours
( ) 4-6 hours
( ) 7-9 hours
( ) 10-12 hours
( ) 13-15 hours
( ) More than 15

7. I learned:

( ) A Great Deal
( ) Some
( ) Not Much
( ) Nothing

8. What I learned is:

( ) Very Important
( ) Important
( ) Generally Unimportant
( ) A Waste

9. Total amount of work is:

( ) Too much
( ) Just right
( ) Too little

10. How helpful did you find the resources you used in this unit?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not helpful	Did not use or Not applicable
Newspaper	( )	( )	( )	( )
Television	( )	( )	( )	( )
Cassette Tape	( )	( )	( )	( )
Slide/Tape	( )	( )	( )	( )
Text	( )	( )	( )	( )
Extra or recommended readings	( )	( )	( )	( )
Study Guide	( )	( )	( )	( )
Learning Center	( )	( )	( )	( )
Toll-free telephone line	( )	( )	( )	( )

11. Please write any additional comments you may have below or use the back of this sheet.

AUNL 4/75

ACCOUNTING 103 END-OF-COURSE EVALUATION FORM

Please note: This is an evaluation of the course, not the instructor.

Answers obtained for the following questions will be used to assist in the improvement of this course in the future. Please answer each of the questions as objectively as you can. Your answers will not affect your grade in any way. Thank you for your help.

NAME _____ SECTION _____

1. Overall, how would you rate this course?

( ) Excellent
( ) Good
( ) Fair
( ) Poor
( ) Unsatisfactory

2. How interesting was this course to you?

( ) Very Interesting
( ) Fairly Interesting
( ) Neutral
( ) Rather Uninteresting
( ) Very Uninteresting

3. Overall, how difficult was this course for you?

( ) Very Difficult
( ) Fairly Difficult
( ) Neutral
( ) Fairly Easy
( ) Very Easy

4. This course places the responsibility for learning on the student:

( ) much too heavily
( ) a little too heavily
( ) about the right amount
( ) not quite enough
( ) much too lightly

5. How would you rate the exams given in this course?

( ) Much too long
( ) Somewhat too long
( ) About right length
( ) Somewhat too short
( ) Much too short

( ) Fair in choice of content
( ) Unfair in content choice

( ) Too difficult
( ) About right difficulty
( ) Too easy

( ) Too many tests
( ) About right nu
( ) Too few tests

6. In the space below, list in order of importance to you the various instructional aids used in the course.

1. _____ 4. _____

2. _____ 5. _____

3. _____ 6. _____

7. Would you recommend this course to your friends as an elective?

Yes _____ No _____ Can't say _____

8. From your experience with this course, would you be willing to take another accounting course even if it was not a required part of your program?

Yes _____ No _____ Can't say _____

9. What specific recommendations would you make for the improvement of this course? (Use back of this sheet if necessary)

10. Would you recommend that the TV programs in this course be used in future semesters?

Definitely Yes Probably Yes Can't Say Probably No Definitely No

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____